DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 389 080 EA 027 191

AUTHOR Ouston, Janet; And Others
TITLE School Improvement through School Inspection?
PUB DATE Apr 95
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 18-22, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Audits (Verification); *Educational Assessment; Educational Improvement; *Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Inspection; *Institutional Evaluation; Standards
IDENTIFIERS *United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

The United Kingdom's 1992 Education Act established the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED), which was mandated to oversee an inspection system for all schools. This paper presents findings of a study that examined the extent to which the inspection process helped schools with their school-development planning. A survey was mailed to headteachers at 282 schools that had been inspected during the 1993 fall term. A total of 170 replies were received, a 60 percent response rate. Most headteachers said that the OFSTED inspection process had made a positive contribution to their schools' development. The data suggest that some tension existed between the OFSTED inspection-action plan and the school's own development plan. Headteachers at schools with some overlap between the OFSTED action plan and the school-development plan expressed positive views about the inspection process. Schools that had favorable experiences with the inspection process had involved their governing bodies and external advisors in formulating their inspection-action plans. Eight tables, a sample questionnaire, and survey data are included. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J Ouston
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

ED 389 080

Paper presented at the AERA Conference, April 1995

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT THROUGH SCHOOL INSPECTION?

by Janet Ouston, Brian Fidler and Peter Earley

The title of this paper reflects the logo of the new Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) in the UK: *Improvement through Inspection*. The research reported here focuses on this issue. Do schools that have been inspected consider the experience to have been helpful to their own development?

INTRODUCTION

Self-Managing Schools

The Education Reform Act (1988) had major implications for schools in England and Wales. Responsibility for most decisions about resources (finance, staffing, maintenance of buildings etc) was delegated to schools and their governing bodies. The overall level of funding available to schools was, in the main, made dependent on the number of pupils in the school thus providing a direct incentive for schools to make themselves attractive to parents (Fidler and Bowles 1989).

At the same time a National Curriculum was introduced which set out what children should learn, but not how it should be taught. These developments were in marked contrast to practice over the preceding forty years, where resource issues had been mainly controlled by Local Education Authorities (school districts) and schools themselves decided on their curriculum with the broad guidelines set by a national examination system for sixteen year olds.

Janet Ouston and Peter Earley are at the Management Development Centre, Institute of Education, University of London (e-mail j.ouston@ioe.ac.uk *or* p.earley@ioe.ac.uk)

Brian Fidler is at the Centre for Education Management, University of Reading (e-mail f.b.fidler@reading.ac.uk)

EA 027 191

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The successful implementation of these reforms has depended on the capacity of each school to manage its own affairs. The leadership and management provided by Headteachers and governing bodies has been of central importance. Schools were expected to draw up School Development Plans (SDPs) to make their priorities explicit and to enable them to review progress.

One of the intentions of the legislation was to make schools more accountable to parents by using market mechanisms to put financial pressures on schools. Whilst a greater accountability to the clients of the school was introduced, direct accountability to others outside the school for professional standards was weakened because of the declining power of Local Educational Authorities (LEAs). The new pattern of inspection was introduced to strengthen professional accountability.

School Inspection

These reforms have had a major impact on the role of the Local Education Authority. One of their responsibilities before 1988 had been to monitor and evaluate their schools. This aspect of their work was undertaken through a long-established tradition of school and classroom visits by LEA inspectors and advisors. (Confusingly, which ever title was used, such people both inspected and advised schools.)

It was apparent, however, that different LEAs were giving differing degrees of emphasis to this function, with many preferring to work with schools in an 'advisory' rather than an 'inspectorial' capacity (Maychell and Keys 1993). Her Majesty's Inspectorate (HMI) - a national body with a remit to report on the education system to the Department for Education - also had a role in reporting on individual schools. But they did not do this on a regular basis, and many schools would have never had a full-scale HMI inspection.

The 1992 Education Act reduced the size and role of HMI and brought into existence the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED). This was established - and funded primarily from resources that previously had been allocated to LEAs - to have three main tasks:

* to devise a framework for school inspections
* to oversee a system of four-yearly inspections of all schools
* to train and accredit inspectors.

The new OFSTED inspection process (OFSTED 1994) was seen as having two components: it served an 'accountability' (or evaluative) purpose through the published inspection report, but it was also intended to act as a spur to, and support for, school development.

The inspection of the first cohort of secondary schools (for pupils aged 11-16 or 18) started in Autumn 1993. This paper is based on the experience of these schools. Inspection of primary schools (for pupils from 5 to 11) started in September 1994.

The style of inspection marked a radical change from the past in a number of important ways:

* it is based on an explicit framework
* it is undertaken by a team of independent inspectors trained to use the framework and working to a contract
* each team is led by a Registered Inspector who has received more extensive training
* each team is required to include a 'lay' inspector who is not a professional educator
* each school is required to produce an Action Plan in response to the main issues identified in the inspection report
* 'special measures' are instituted for schools that are considered to be unsatisfactory.

Most of these new OFSTED inspectors had, in fact, substantial previous experience of inspection as LEA inspectors and advisors. The training was, therefore, mainly to familiarise them with the new inspection requirements.

The inspection framework requires inspectors to report on four main areas:

* the educational standards achieved by the school
* the quality of education provided by the school
* the efficiency of management of resources
* the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of the students.

Inspections typically last five days and can involve up to 15 inspectors for a typical secondary school.

The findings of each inspection contribute to the annual report of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools to the Secretary of State for Education. Of more significance to the individual school, however, is the legal requirement for it - or strictly speaking its governing body - to circulate a summary of the inspection report, good or bad. It also has to produce an Action Plan dealing with the 'key issues for action' identified by the inspectors. It is primarily through this mechanism, but also through preparation for inspection, and the inspection process itself, that the stated aim of OFSTED *Improvement through Inspection* is to be achieved.

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

Background

In 1986 central government changed the basis of planning and funding professional development for serving teachers. Schools and LEAs were required to draw up plans for professional development based on the assessed needs of schools and teachers and within a pre-determined budget. The concept of institutional needs had been discussed for many years, but most schools found it difficult to identify them. School Development Planning started primarily as a way of identifying training needs for the whole school, although some LEAs saw such plans as having a wider role to play as part of good management practice.

To stimulate such planning, the central government education department,then called the Department of Education and Science (DES) funded a small research project to formulate advice to schools on development planning. Two publications appeared in 1989 and 1991 (DES 1989, 1991). Further advice appeared in a book by the two principal researchers (Hargreaves & Hopkins 1991). This built upon work in the 1980s on school self-evaluation as a mechanism for school improvement (McMahon et al 1984). Such advice, available to all schools, was supplemented in many cases by further material from individual local authorities.

Approaches to planning

School development planning has developed in different ways in different schools. This makes it difficult to generalise about practice in general. Undoubtedly there is a spectrum that ranges from plans which might be considered as strategic plans for the whole school (Fidler, Bowles and Hart, 1991) to those which are operational plans for implementing the flow of legislation from central government, in particular the National Curriculum.

Plans are produced annually and, according to government guidance, in detail only for one year with 'longer term priorities for the following two or three years....in *outline*' (DES 1989). They are likely to fit into a cycle which includes staff development priorities for each financial year beginning in April. As the school year starts in September most plans cover two years in detail and a longer period in outline.

Recent research findings in primary schools have confirmed anecdotal evidence that the practice of development planing is very varied (MacGilchrist and Savage 1994). The extent of the involvement of staff and the extent to which such plans are working documents for action in the school are just two dimensions on which they differ.

THE SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND INSPECTION

It could be expected that every English school would have been involved in school development planning (of varying degrees of sophistication) for a number of years before it was inspected. Indeed given the length of notice which schools have of the inspection, it might have been expected that the most recent school development plan would have been produced in the knowledge of a forthcoming inspection, and that it had been influenced by that knowledge. If a school shared OFSTED's priorities for its work and had evaluated its own performance in similar terms to those of the OFSTED inspectors, its priorities for development should be similar to the points for action in the OFSTED report.

Difficulties will arise if there is a serious mismatch between the school's own development plan and the points for action identified by the OFSTED inspection team. This will happen if either the school's priorities for action differ from OFSTED's assumptions about the features of an effective school, or that the school is not effective at identifying its own weaknesses through self-evaluation.

THE RESEARCH

The research questions

The three main research questions were:

* did schools find the new pattern of OFSTED inspections helpful in their own development?
* what was the relationship between the OFSTED 'action planning process' and the school's development plan?
* how could the inspection process aid schools in a more effective and efficient way?

Data were collected on how schools prepared for inspection, their assessment of the value of the verbal debriefing they received at the end of the inspection and the value of the final written report which is delivered six weeks after the inspection. Some details of action planning after the inspection report and opinions about changes to the process were also sought.

It should be appreciated that this study was undertaken at least three months after the inspection when each school had produced its action plan. This may affect perceptions of the process compared to an immediate reaction.

Sample

The schools included in this research were all inspected during the first term, from September to December 1993. Postal questionnaires were sent to the Headteachers of all 282 schools in May 1994 and 170 replies were received: a response rate of 60%.

Questionnaire

A copy of the Questionnaire is included in Appendix A.

FINDINGS

Schools responding to the questionnaire

Tables B1 to B10 (in Appendix B) give background information about the schools. They suggest that the schools in the study were reasonably typical of English schools as a whole.

The Inspection

The inspection team One of the intentions of the new inspection pattern was to separate inspection and advice, and to ensure that schools were inspected by inspectors who had no previous contact with the school and hence no preconceptions about it, nor had a continuing advisory role with the school.

Whilst this intention was not expected to be fulfilled in all cases, it was a general expectation of the new inspection process. However, just over 40% of team leaders were known to the school before the inspection (Table B11) and in 63% of inspections at least one team member was known to the school (Table B12).

Pre-inspection preparation The inspection framework was produced and modified shortly before the first inspections. Thus there was some apprehension about the new arrangements. Fear of the consequences of an adverse report led some schools to adopt an adversarial approach to the inspection and the inspectors. This may explain the fact that 87% of schools reported that at least one member of staff attended a pre-inspection preparation course (Table B13) and just under a quarter employed a pre-inspection consultant (Table B14).

Contribution of the inspection to school development

Contribution of phases of the inspection The relatively long time from notification of inspection until the actual event led the researchers to expect that schools would take steps to overhaul aspects of their work due to be inspected, and that they might make improvements in advance of the actual inspection.

At the end of the inspection the head and senior staff of the school are given a verbal account of the inspection findings. This also provides an opportunity for the staff to ask questions of the inspector and talk informally. Finally, within six weeks of the inspection a written report of 20-30 pages is sent to the school which gives quantitative and qualitative findings. This includes reports on the teaching of individual subjects.

The schools were asked to rate the value of each of the three phases: pre-inspection preparation, the inspection itself, and the inspection report. They were asked to assess the contribution that they made to their development on a six-point scale from 0 - *no contribution* to 5 - *major contribution*. These findings are shown in Tables B15, B16 and B17.

Table 1 below combines information from Tables B15, B16 and B17 and presents percentages of schools.

Table 1: Contribution to development

Contribution	Preparation %	Verbal Report %	Final Report %
0 - none	4.7	1.8	2.4
1	12.4	11.2	7.1
2	15.3	18.8	13.5
3	32.4	34.1	37.1
4	27.6	28.2	28.8
5 - major	7.6	5.8	11.2
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean	2.89	2.94	3.16
(Number of schools	170	170	170)

These tables show that schools in general reported that the Final Report made slightly more contribution to School Development than did the verbal report or the preparation for the inspection. Schools that found one phase helpful in contributing to school

development were also likely to report that the other phases were also useful. Similarly schools that found one phase not useful were likely to report that the others were not useful. These results will be used later in this paper to create a score indicating the overall contribution of the inspection process to development.

Action planning phase

Timing From receipt of the report schools are allowed 40 working days to produce an Action Plan. Depending on the seriousness and number of the issues which the Action Plan is required to address, this length of time might have been considered inadequate. Only 16% of schools reported that the time allowed for action planning was too short (Table B18).

Governors' contribution The governing body of the school approve policies and set the general direction for the school. The Action Plan is officially theirs and so heads were asked what part the governing body had played in drawing up the Action Plan.

Only 6% of schools reported that their governing bodies had made a major contribution to the Action Plan. The majority of schools reported that their governors had made some contribution, but only one-third were above the mid-point of the scale. Nine per cent were said to have made no contribution at all (Table B19).

Action plan and school development plan As explained above, most schools have a development plan which is updated each year. Schools were asked to indicate the extent to which the points made by the inspectors and addressed in the action plan overlapped with the existing school development plan. Table B20 shows that in most schools there was some overlap, but only 6% reported a complete overlap, with the inspectors' action points already completely included in the development plan.

The extent of this overlap and its relationship with other aspects of the survey are discussed later in this paper.

External advisors and LEA Only 15% of schools used an external adviser to help formulate the action plan (Table B21) and half the schools received some help from their LEA (Table B22).

Implementation of the plan

Just over 20% of schools employed an external consultant to help implement the plan (Table B23) and 86% of schools said that their teachers would need additional training to implement some aspects of the action plan (Table B24).

Changes to the OFSTED process

Just under a third of schools thought that additional areas should be included in the inspection process (Table B25). The following areas were mentioned by schools:

* links with parents, employers and the community
* understanding of the school context and the use of 'value added' statistics
* non National Curriculum subjects
* business studies, economics, vocational courses
* community education
* the 6th form
* the school library
* the extra curricular programme
* strategic aspects of school management
* the quality of relationships
* provision for children with SEN.

There was disagreement about whether the inspection should be tailored to the individual school (Table B26). There was also disagreement about what should happen if resources for inspection were halved (Table B27). Just under half the schools proposed reducing data collection. These disagreements perhaps reflect the differences between schools in whether they see the inspection process as being mainly for accountability, or mainly for development. Those seeing the process as being for accountability seem likely to argue for a common approach, whereas those emphasising development will value tailoring the process to the school.

VALUE OF INSPECTION TO SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT

As explained above, schools were asked to assess how useful the process was to their school's development. In order to create an index of the overall value of the inspection, the answers to the three questions about the phases of the inspection were added together to give a score which ranged from 0 to 15. Schools which found the inspection of little or no value would score low, those which found it very valuable would score high. Table 2 below shows the distribution of schools on this combined measure.

Table 2: Value of inspection to School Development

	N	%
Not valuable (0-3)	11	(6.5)
Moderately valuable (4-11)	126	(74.1)
Very valuable (12-15)	33	(19.4)
Total	170	(100.0)
Mean score	8.99	

The value of the inspection process was assessed using this score as a measure of the school's response.

Acting Headteachers There was a trend for acting Heads to be more positive than permanent heads. Nine of the 11 acting Heads gave a score of at least 9. The mean score for these Heads was 9.9, and for Heads in a permanent post 8.9.

Years as a Head Newly appointed heads in their first year, and Heads who had been in post more than ten years were the most positive. The mean scores are shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Mean score for value of inspection by years in post

Years in post	Mean score	N
Less than one	10.4	(18)
Two to five	8.2	(27)
Five to ten	8.8	(88)
More than ten	9.3	(36)
Missing		(1)
Total		(170)

As might be expected, the acting Headteachers had all been in post for a short period. The findings set out in Table 3 are not accounted for by the positive responses of the acting Heads. When the 11 acting Heads are excluded from the analysis a similar pattern is found for those in permanent posts.

Team leader Schools where the OFSTED team leader was not known were more positive than those where he/she was known to the school before the inspection. Table 4 shows this relationship.

Table 4: Team leader known to school

	Mean score	N
Yes	8.5	(69)
No	9.3	(99)
Missing		(2)
Total		(170)

Acting Headteachers were less likely to know the team leader than were those in permanent posts, but this does not account for the difference which exists for Heads in permanent posts across all years of experience.

Role of the governing body Schools where the governors were reported as contributing to the action plan were more likely to be positive about the value of the inspection process as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Value of inspection and governors' contribution

Contribution of governors	Mean score	N
Minor (0,1)	8.6	(76)
Moderate (2,3)	8.9	(69)
Major (4,5)	10.4	(24)
Missing		(1)
Total		(170)

Compatibility with the School Development Plan Schools were asked how compatible the Action Plan which resulted from the inspection was with the school's existing development plan. Those who found the inspection most useful to their school's development were those where there was a moderate overlap. This is shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Compatibility with the SDP

Relationship with SDPs	Mean score	N
Included (0,1)	8.0	(51)
Some overlap(2,3)	9.5	(90)
No overlap (4,5)	9.1	(28)
Missing		(1)
Total		(170)

This is not a surprising finding and might be interpreted along the following lines. Schools that were positive about the inspection found that it confirmed their own perceptions of the school but they gained a new perspective. Schools where there was major overlap between the SDP and the inspection findings felt that 'they had learned nothing new'. Schools where there was no overlap probably found the inspectors failed to share their values and priorities.

Use of external advisor Schools that used an external advisor to help formulate the action plan were more positive about the inspection's contribution to school development than were those that did not. The mean values are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Use of an external advisor

	Mean score	N
Yes	10.0	(26)
No	8.8	(143)
Missing		(1)
Total		(170)

Contribution of LEA inspector or advisor to the action plan Similarly, schools that were more positive about the contribution of inspection were more likely to have obtained help from the LEA. Table 8 shows these results.

Table 8: Contribution of the LEA

Contribution of LEA	Mean score	N
None	8.5	(86)
Minor	9.3	(69)
Major	9.9	(15)
Total		(170)

Interestingly, the use of a consultant to help the school *implement* the plan was unrelated to their perceptions of the value of the inspection to school development.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has shown that most Headteachers were positive about the contribution that the OFSTED inspection process had made to their school's development. Only around 6% of Heads were quite negative about the its contribution.

Possible tensions between the inspection Action Plan, and the school's own development plan, are also suggested. Schools where there was some overlap between the two were much more positive than those where the action points were already included in the school's plan. These schools possibly felt that they had learned nothing new from what many schools have said was a very stressful experience. This raises issues concerning the ways in which the Inspection Report might be drafted to assist schools in taking their development plans forward, rather than merely confirming their priorities. Schools where there was no overlap were also less positive. It would be interesting to follow up these schools to see how they resolved the conflicting demands of the two different plans. Would the Action Plan take priority? It will also be interesting to see what role governing bodies play in monitoring the progress of Action Plans.

The findings show that in schools where the inspection process made a major contribution to development, the governing body of the school was involved in formulating the Action Plan, as were external advisors. Other case study evidence points to the fact that those schools which considered that inspections could be of value to them were more likely to report positively on the inspection afterwards. Schools that could envisage ways of making use of the inspection process were more likely to report positively on its value.

Throughout the interpretation of this study it must be borne in mind that these findings come from the responses of senior members of school staffs - usually the Headteacher. Research work currently being undertaken at Oxford Brookes University suggests that classroom teachers, at least initially, may be less positive and even rather demoralised by the process. From informal discussion with schools, many report a period of 'post-inspection blues' at the end of the inspection, but this may become lessened as the findings become integrated with the school's work. The study reported here collected data at least three months after the inspection.

REFERENCES

DES (1989) *Planning for School Development: Advice to Governors, Headteachers and Teachers.* London: DES.

DES (1991) *Development Planning: A Practical Guide.* London: DES

Fidler B & Bowles G (eds)(1989) *Effective Local Management of Schools: A strategic approach.* London: Longman.

Fidler B, Bowles G & Hart J (1991) *ELMS Workbook: Planning Your School's Strategy.* London: Longman

Hargreaves D and Hopkins D (1991) *The Empowered School.* London: Cassell

MacGilchrist B & Savage J (1994) *The Impact of School Development Planning in Primary Schools: Early Findings.* Paper presented to 1994 BERA Conference, Oxford University

McMahon, A et al (1984) *Guidelines for Review and Internal Development in Schools* (GRIDS). London: Longman

Maychell,K and Keys, W (1993) *Under Inspection: LEA evaluation and monitoring.* Slough: National Foundation for Educational Research

OPSTED (1994) *Handbook for the Inspection of Schools.* London: HMSO

BEMAS Improving School Management Initiative

OFSTED Initial Questionnaire (R2)

Please answer the following questions on the basis of the inspection which has taken place under the new OFSTED framework since August 1993

Date of inspection .....

Information on the school

1 Please give the following information on your school by writing in or circling the appropriate answer

a) Number of pupils
- Main school .....
- Sixth form .....
- **Total** .....

b) Status
- LEA
- Voluntary Controlled
- Voluntary Aided
- Grant Maintained
- CTC
- Other

c) Pupils:
- Percentage (approx) eligible for
- Section 11 support .....
- Free school meals .....

d) Location
- County town/rural
- Suburban
- Urban
- Inner city

e) Designated community school Yes/No

and the headteacher

2 Information about the headteacher

a) permanent post/acting head

b) male/female

c) number of years as head of this school .....

The Inspection

3 Has any of the inspection team had a previous connection with the school?

a) The team leader Yes/No

b) Some/all team members Yes/No

4 Did you or any of your staff attend any inspection preparation/pre-inspection course(s)?

Yes/No

5 Did the school employ an external consultant or inspector/advisor to carry out a pre-inspection review of the school?

Yes/No

6 Did the process of **preparing** for the inspection make a major contribution to your school's development?

0 1 2 3 4 5

no contribution major contribution

7 Did the **verbal feedbacks** received during or shortly after the inspection make a major contribution to your school's development?

0 1 2 3 4 5

no contribution major contribution

8 Did the inspector's **final written report** make a major contribution to your school's development ?

0 1 2 3 4 5

no contribution major contribution

9 After receipt of the report, schools have 40 working days to produce their action plan. For your governors was this time

Please tick

Too short ☐

About right ☐

Too long ☐

10 To what extent did the governors contribute to the action plan?

0 1 2 3 4 5

no contribution major contribution

11. To what extent was the action plan restating developments already in your school's current development plan (SDP or IDP)?

0 1 2 3 4 5

Action plan already fully included in the current SDP

Action plan focuses on different areas from the current SDP

12. Did the school **make use of** a consultant or other external advisor to help formulate the action plan?

Yes/No

12. To what extent did an LEA inspector or advisor contribute to the action plan?

Please tick

no contribution ☐
minor contribution ☐
major contribution ☐

13. Does the school expect to employ a consultant or other external advisor to help implement the action plan?

Yes/No

14. Will the implementation of the action plan require any additional staff training or INSET?

Yes/No

15. Are there areas not covered by the OFSTED Framework which you consider should be included?

Yes/No

If **Yes**, please give brief details

16. To what extent do you think that the OFSTED inspection process should be tailored to the individual school?

0 1 2 3 4 5

The same framework should be applied in the same way to all schools

The school should have the opportunity to propose areas of its activity on which it would like a specific comment

17. If the resources devoted to the inspection process had to be reduced by half how could they be used to best effect to ensure accountability and school development?

Please tick

Keep the present Framework and reduce data collection ☐
Omit some areas from the Framework ☐
Other ☐

Please comment further if you wish

Name and status of respondent .....

Phone number .....

Would you be willing to answer further questions in a short interview by telephone?

Yes/No

Please indicate if your school would be willing to act as an anonymous case-study.

Yes/No/Possibly

Thank you very much for your help.
Please use the space below to provide any other information or comments you wish to make about the OFSTED inspection process.

Please return the completed questionnaire to:
Peter Earley, BEMAS Project, NFER,
The Mere, Upton Park,
Slough SL1 2DQ,
Berks.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

Table B1: Status of school

	N	%
Local Authority (LEA)	124	(72.9)
Voluntary controlled	7	(4.1)
Voluntary aided	11	(6.5)
Grant maintained	27	(15.9)
Special	1	(0.6)
Total	170	(100.0)

(LEA schools are provided by the Local Education Authority.

Voluntary schools are also provided by the LEA, but have a link with a voluntary body, usually the Anglican or Catholic church, who contribute to the school and also have some management responsibility for the school.

Grant maintained schools are independent of the LEA within which they are located and are funded directly by central government. They are similar to Charter Schools in the US.

Special schools are for children with disabilities or other special educational needs that cannot be met in a mainstream school.)

Table B2: Size of main school

	N	%
Less than 500 pupils	31	(18.2)
500 - 999 pupils	107	(62.9)
1000+ pupils	32	(18.8)
Total	170	(100.0)

(The 'main' school includes pupils up to the end of compulsory schooling at the age of 16 years. The average size of main school 743.7 pupils, range 94 to 1,500.)

Table B3: School has a 6th form?

	N	%
No 6th form	82	(48.2)
Has 6th form	88	(51.8)
Total	170	(100.0)

(In some schools pupils over 16 stay into the 'sixth form'. In other schools all pupils who wish to stay on transfer to college.)

Table B4: Pupils eligible for Section 11 support

Percentage of pupils	N	%
0	90	(67.2)
1-10	25	(18.7)
11-50	14	(10.4)
51+	5	(3.7)
Missing	36	
Total	170	(100.0)

(Section 11 support provides additional resources for English language tuition.)

Table B5: Pupils eligible for free school meals

Percentage of pupils	N	%
0- 5	31	(19.9)
6-10	35	(22.4)
11-25	41	(26.3)
26-50	37	(23.7)
51+	12	(7.7)
Missing	14	
Total	170	(100.0)

(Children from poor families are provided with free mid-day meals.)

Table B6: Location of school

	N	%
Rural, country town	64	(38.1)
Suburban	44	(26.2)
Urban	35	(20.8)
Inner city	25	(14.9)
Missing	2	
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B7: Community School

	N	%
Yes	30	(18.0)
No	137	(82.0)
Missing	3	
Total	170	(100.0)

(A community school provides courses for the community after school hours.)

Table B8: Status of Head

	N	%
Permanent	158	(93.5)
Acting	11	(6.5)
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B9: Gender of Head

	N	%
Male	135	(81.3)
Female	31	(18.7)
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B10: Years as a Head

	N	%
Less than 1 year	18	(10.6)
1-4 years	27	(16.0)
5-9 years	88	(52.1)
10 or more years	36	(21.3)
Missing	1	
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B11: Team leader known to the school

	N	%
Yes	69	(41.1)
No	99	(58.9)
Missing	2	
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B12: Some/all team members known to the school

	N	%
Yes	105	(63.3)
No	61	(36.7)
Missing	4	
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B13: Attended pre-inspection preparation courses

	N	%
Yes	147	(87.0)
No	22	(13.0)
Missing	1	
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B14: Use of pre-inspection consultant

	N	%
Yes	41	(24.4)
No	127	(75.6)
Missing	2	
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B15: Contribution of preparation to school's development

	N	%
0 - none	8	(4.7)
1	21	(12.4)
2	26	(15.3)
3	55	(32.4)
4	47	(27.6)
5 - major	13	(7.6)
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B16: Contribution of verbal feedback to school's development

	N	%
0 - none	3	(1.8)
1	19	(11.2)
2	32	(18.8)
3	58	(34.1)
4	48	(28.2)
5 - major	10	(5.8)
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B17: Contribution of final report to school development

	N	%
0 - none	4	(2.4)
1	12	(7.1)
2	23	(13.5)
3	63	(37.1)
4	49	(28.8)
5 - major	19	(11.2)
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B18: Timing of action plan

	N	%
Too short	28	(16.5)
About right	138	(81.2)
Too long	4	(2.4)
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B19: Contribution of the governors to the action plan

	N	%
0 - none	15	(8.9)
1	61	(36.1)
2	34	(20.1)
3	35	(20.7)
4	13	(7.7)
5 - major	11	(6.5)
Missing	1	
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B20: Overlap between action plan (AP) and school development plan (SDP)

	N	%
0 - AP fully included	10	(5.9)
1 in SDP	41	(24.3)
2	43	(25.4)
3	47	(27.8)
4	20	(11.8)
5 - AP covers different areas to SDP	8	(4.7)
Missing	1	
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B21: Use of external advisor to help formulate the AP

	N	%
Yes	26	(15.4)
No	143	(84.6)
Missing	1	
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B22: Contribution of LEA to AP

	N	%
None	86	(50.6)
Minor	69	(40.6)
Major	15	(8.8)
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B23: Use of external adviser to help implement the action plan.

	N	%
Yes	35	(20.7)
No	134	(79.3)
Missing	1	
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B24: Will the implementation of the AP require staff training

	N	%
Yes	146	(86.4)
No	23	(13.6)
Missing	1	
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B25: Additional areas that should be inspected

	N	%
Yes	51	(31.5)
No	111	(68.5)
Missing	1	
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B26: Inspection tailored to the particular school

	N	%
0 - same framework in	23	(14.5)
1 all schools	17	(10.7)
2	18	(11.3)
3	29	(18.2)
4	46	(28.9)
5 - schools propose areas	26	(16.4)
Missing	11	
Total	170	(100.0)

Table B27: If resources were halved

	N	%
Reduce data collection	76	(47.5)
Omit some area	38	(23.8)
Omit areas and less data	14	(8.7)
Other	32	(20.0)
Missing	10	
Total	170	(100.0)

American Educational Research Association
April 18-22, 1995

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

EA027191

ERIC

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

AERA /ERIC Acquisitions
The Catholic University of America
210 O'Boyle Hall
Washington, DC 20064

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT THROUGH SCHOOL INSPECTION?	
Author(s): OUSTON, J., FIDLER, B., EARLEY, P.	
Corporate Source: Institute of Education University of London	Publication Date: 1995 (April)

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following options and sign the release below.

☑ Sample sticker to be affixed to document — Sample sticker to be affixed to document ☐

Check here

Permitting microfiche (4" x 6" film), paper copy, electronic, and optical media reproduction

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Janet Ouston
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 1

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 2

or here

Permitting reproduction in other than paper copy

Sign Here, Please

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: Janet Ouston	Position: HEAD OF MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT CENTRE
Printed Name: JANET OUSTON	Organization: INST. OF EDUCATION UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
Address: INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION 55 GORDON SQ., LONDON WC1H 0NU	Telephone Number: ( ) + 171 612 6425
	Date: 18 April 1995

You can send this form and your document to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation. They will forward your materials to the appropriate ERIC Clearinghouse. ERIC/AERA Acquisitions, ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation, 210 O'Boyle Hall, The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC 20064, (800) 464-3742

CUA

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
Department of Education, O'Boyle Hall
Washington, DC 20064
202 319-5120

March 1995

Dear AERA Presenter,

Congratualations on being a presenter at AERA. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation would like you to contribute to ERIC by providing us with a written copy of your presentation. Submitting your paper to ERIC ensures a wider audience by making it available to members of the education community who could not attend the session or this year's conference.

Abstracts of papers that are accepted by ERIC appear in RIE and are announced to over 5,000 organizations. The inclusion of your work makes it readily available to other researchers, provides a permanent archive, and enhances the quality of RIE. Your contribution will be accessible through the printed and electronic versions of RIE, through the microfiche collections that are housed at libraries around the country and the world, and through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

We are gathering all the papers from the AERA Conference. We will route your paper to the appropriate clearinghouse and you will be notified if your paper meets ERIC's criteria. Documents are reviewed for contribution to education, timeliness, relevance, methodology, effectiveness of presentation, and reproduction quality.

To disseminate your work through ERIC, you need to sign the reproduction release form on the back of this letter and include it with **two** copies of your paper. You can drop of the copies of your paper and reproduction release form at the ERIC booth (615) o. mail to our attention at the address below. Please feel free to copy the form for future or additional submissions.

Mail to: AERA 1995/ERIC Acquisitions
The Catholic University of America
O'Boyle Hall, Room 210
Washington, DC 20064

Sincerely,

Lawrence M. Rudner, Ph.D.
Director, ERIC/AE